

THE Converted Catholic.

When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethern.—Luke xxii., 32.

EDITED BY FATHER O'CONNOR.

Vol. II.

AUGUST, 1885.

No. 9.

CONTENTS

Editorial Notes.....	257	The Moral Theology of the Jesuits.
Converts from Rome. Letters		Different Systems of Prob-
from many Converts....	261	abilism: First Thesis; Second
Roman Catholic Convents and		Thesis; Third Thesis; Fourth
American Institutions. By		Thesis. Cases of Conscience. 274
Rev. Stephen Dekins.....	266	Father O'Connor's Letters to
The Church of Rome evidently		Cardinal McCloskey (second
proved Heretick. By Dr.		series). Letter VIII..... 280
Peter Berault, A.D. 1670....	270	Rome: Pagan and Papal (con-
		tinued). Chapters xiii., xiv. 283

EDITORIAL NOTES.

THE RESULTS OF OUR PREACHING services in Masonic Temple, New York, from the first of January of this year to the first of July show twenty-five converts from Rome. This is not a great number, but when it is borne in mind that these converts have given testimony to the saving power of the blood of Christ while renouncing Romanism, it is a hopeful sign, and an encouragement for more work in this part of the Lord's vineyard.

IN EVERY LAND CATHOLICS ARE coming out of Rome. Since Canon Foulks returned from the Roman priesthood to the Anglican Church he

has received the recantations of fifty Romanists in England. On a recent Sunday, Pastor Berthe, of Brest, France, received thirty converted Roman Catholics at the Lord's Supper. The Presbyterian Church at Valparaiso, during the present year has added to its number one hundred and fifty Roman Catholic converts. The London *Christian* has a record every week of converts from Rome in all parts of the world. We wish the editors of the religious press in this country would pay attention to these signs of the times, as the *Christian* does.

AFTER A VISIT to Mr. Moody's Conference of Christian Workers at Northfield, this month, we will resume our

preaching services in Masonic Temple, Sixth Avenue and Twenty-third Street, New York. It is the most reasonable in rent and the best in location that we can find in the city. When the "good times" (financially) come again—and we hope they will begin to come this Fall—we will resume collecting for a modest building where we can preach and work without having heavy rents to pay. Our efforts in this direction last year brought us five hundred dollars in small subscriptions, with promises of as much more; but we fear the general depression in business has caused those promises to remain indefinitely unpaid. However, hope deferred does *not* make our heart sick. Hope on, hope ever.

THERE ARE TWO ROMAN CATHOLIC dioceses in the State of Massachusetts—Boston, which is an arch-diocese, and Springfield. To which of these does the editor of the *New York Christian Advocate* refer in the following paragraph?

The Roman Catholic churches of the diocese of Massachusetts, under the direction of the bishop, will hereafter rent seats at every mass. Free seats will be given to those too poor to pay, and ushers will protect those who do pay. This takes the place of "church-door collections." The boasted "equality" of Romanism, often contrasted with Protestantism, is only on the surface. The more money, the more masses, dispensations, etc.

THE SHOCKING DEATH OF THE Trappist monk, Father Emanuel, in Gethsemane, Kentucky, a full account of which appeared in our last issue, has aroused the indignation of our readers. The account of the murder—for mur-

der it was in the sight of Heaven—was sent by the Associated Press to all the daily papers of the country, yet not a word of condemnation has appeared in any of the religious papers of the United States. How long, O Lord, how long will Catholics who dissent from Rome's cruelties and wickedness be left unprotected? One of our best and dearest friends, a descendant of the Puritans, writes as follows on the subject:

"In reading the July number of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, I could hardly believe what was written about the death of Father Emanuel. The article was quoted as a despatch from Louisville. Can those facts be vouched for? Mormonism is bad enough, but must an old man of seventy-three years be tormented to death, and no one be found to bring the perpetrators of such a deed to punishment? If our whole Government is afraid of Rome, it is time we knew it. Let editors do their duty. Let the children of God cry unto Him for a deliverer who will unbar every prison and lead the captives forth. H. C. G."

MISS CLEVELAND, THE PRESIDENT'S sister, has incurred the displeasure of the Pope by condemning monastic institutions in her book, recently published by Funk & Wagnalls. She rightly thinks that men and women should live their lives in view of the public, if they desire to do good and have no "works of darkness" to conceal. But she does not know, she cannot know, how many sorrowful hearts are immured in those convents. The article by Rev. Stephen Dekins in this issue throws a flood of light on one of the worst of these institutions in this country. "Entombed for Life," should be written on the doors of

the Dominican convent in Newark. The sad face of every nun one meets on the street bears the imprint of the heart's tale of woe.

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE was proclaimed by Pius IX., July 13th, 1870—fifteen years ago. Three months afterwards Victor Emanuel, as king of Italy, made Rome his capital, and the Papal supremacy, even in Rome itself, was at an end. Hundreds of priests and thousands of people have since renounced spiritual allegiance to this man "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things." Yes, the apostle Paul and the other apostles told that the Lord will permit only for a time that those who seek Him in honesty of heart should be cheated and defrauded out of the fruits of his life and death by a false Church.

IN THE NEW "CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE," prepared and published by order of the third Plenary Council of the Roman Catholic Church, which was held in Baltimore last November, the attributes of the Church are specified: authority, infallibility, and indefectibility; and the question is asked, "In whom are these attributes found in their fulness?"

Answer. "These attributes are found in their fulness in the Pope, the visible Head of the Church, whose infallible authority to teach bishops, priests, and people in matters of faith or morals will last to the end of the world." Comment on this is unneces-

sary. Let the Roman Catholic people themselves judge whether this Italian priest who was elected Pope can save their souls as truly as the Lord Jesus Christ can. Choose ye, which master will ye serve, and which Saviour will ye have. Can the Pope with all his "infallibility" do as much for your salvation, my Roman Catholic friends, as Almighty God has done? The poor man cannot forgive his own sins, much less yours. But see from the Bible, even your own Douay version, what God says of your sins if you trust in Jesus alone. They are

Blotted out,	Isa. xliii., 25
Borne by another,	I. Pet. ii., 24
Cast behind God's back, Isa. xxxviii., 17	
Cast into the depths of	
the sea,	Mic. vii., 19
Covered,	Rom. iv., 17
Finished,	Dan. ix., 24
Forgiven,	Col. ii., 13
Not imputed,	Rom. iv., 8
Not remembered,	Heb. viii., 12
Pardoned,	Mic. vii., 18
Put away,	Heb. ix., 26
Remitted,	Acts x., 43
Removed,	Psa. ciii., 12
Sought for and not found, Jer. i., 20	
Taken away,	Isa. vi., 7
Washed away with blood, I. John i., 7	

THE RESTORATION OF THE TEMPORAL power of the Pope is the fond hope of leading Roman Catholics throughout the world. A general European war would be hailed as a special providence by them. It is only by a general upheaval of social forces that the Pope can regain his lost power. The condition of the city of Rome to-day, where there are more than a score of Protestant churches and mission-schools within its walls, is in strong

contrast with what it was in the days when the Pope was king.

Writing of his experience in Rome fifty years ago, Professor S. F. B. Morse, the father of electric telegraphy, says, "I was a stranger in Rome, and recovering from the debility of a slight fever; I was walking for air and gentle exercise in the Corso, on the day of the celebration of *Corpus Christi*. From the houses on each side were hung rich tapestries and gold embroidered damasks, and toward me slowly advanced a long procession decked out with all the heathenish paraphernalia of this self-styled Church. In a part of the procession a lofty *baldichino* or canopy, borne by men, was held above the idol, the host, before which, as it passed, all heads were uncovered, and every knee bent but mine. Ignorant of the customs of heathenism, I turned my back to the procession, and close to the side of the houses in the crowd (as I supposed unobserved) I was noting in my tablets the order of the assemblage. I was suddenly aroused from my occupation, and staggered by a blow upon the head from the gun and bayonet of a soldier, which struck off my hat far into the crowd.

"Upon recovering from the shock, the soldier, with the expression of a demon, and his mouth pouring forth a torrent of Italian oaths, in which *il diavolo* had a prominent place, stood with his bayonet against my breast. I could make no resistance; I could only ask him why he struck me, and receive in answer his fresh volley of unintelligible imprecations, which having delivered, he resumed his place in the guard of honor, by the side of the officiating cardinal."

IN REPLY TO A CORRESPONDENT who inquiries about the water used in Baptism in the Roman Catholic Church we give the following form of blessing such water, translated from the Roman Ritual. The priest says, extending his hand over the water:

I exorcise this water in the name of God the Father Omnipotent, in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord and in virtue of the Holy Ghost. (The three usual crossings at mention of these names are made.) I conjure every adverse and devilish power, that all phantasy remove from and forsake this element of water, so that it become a fountain springing up into life eternal; to the end that they who may be baptized in it may become temples of the living God and that the Holy Ghost may dwell in them unto the remission of their sins, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, who will come to judge the quick, the dead, and the world by fire. Amen.

THE REV. DR. S. I. PRIME, senior editor of the New York *Observer*, died on July 18th, aged seventy-three years. He was a watchman on the tower where Rome was concerned in this country. "Kirwan's Letters to Archbishop Hughes" first appeared in the *Observer*, and Dr. Prime wrote a very entertaining Life of their author, Rev. Nicholas Murray who was a Presbyterian pastor in Elizabeth, N. J., for many years. Dr. Prime's "Irenæus' Letters" in the *Observer* were always interesting and were sure to be the first article read in the paper. He was an uncompromising foe of Romanism, and manifested much interest in the Reformed Catholic movement all over the world. A great and good man is gone to meet his reward.

THE "PROBABILISM" OF THE JESUITS in this issue should be read by every Protestant minister in the United States.

CONVERTS FROM ROME.

—
WHEATLY RIVER,
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND,
June 6th, 1885.

DEAR FATHER O'CONNOR:

I was so glad to see some of your publications here. Please send them all to me, as I am deeply interested in your work.

A few years ago I left the Roman Catholic faith. My parents were Irish. When young I was left an orphan and given into the hands of French people of this Island, who are all Catholics. I was ever miserable in my French home, these people being very ignorant. I found religion very hard and comfortless for the broken in heart. I learned to read French (although I went to school but a few months), and sought to know all that I could by reading. I believed the religion to be right, and prayed for God's favor, but I could find no good for my soul in performing the rules of the Church. Having learned a few words of English I resolved to visit my kindred, and since then I am living with my brother and have learned to read and speak English. When visiting my neighbors, as I looked at their books I was surprised to see that the Protestant Bible was the same as the Catholic, of which I had seen but a part. Being anxious to see what the whole Bible contained, I borrowed one, but I had no idea that I would turn Protestant, as I did not see how it would make me any better. But I was in much trouble of mind, and the state of my soul would press upon me. At last I resolved to call upon the Lord my God, and I read the seven penitential Psalms as I thought that much of them suited

my case, though I did not understand the whole of them. A glimpse of hope came into my mind, which encouraged me to pray on, and after a few days, suddenly—as I thought—I saw the Lord Jesus as my Saviour. I remembered Mary Magdalene at the feet of Jesus, and the penitent thief on the cross; and looking at the Scriptures, I saw the errors and abominations of the Roman Church. Oh! how glad and thankful I was for this wonderful revelation of the Holy Bible and the Christian religion. I knew then that I was happy, and though I have experienced trials and doubts since, I rejoice yet more in God my Saviour, “who remembered me in my low estate, for his mercy endureth forever.” I am very much pleased when I hear of the good work that you and Father Chiniquy are doing. When I lived with the French I heard of Father Chiniquy as the wicked apostate priest who ruined many Catholics and would still ruin all that he could. He was on this Island about sixteen years ago, and there was much talk of Chiniquy and his bad books; and the parish priest warned his flock to beware of the wolf. I thought then that I would like to read his books, as the priest did no good to my soul. I earnestly pray that this priest may come out of his wretched condition for his own good, and to enlighten his congregation, whom I love in the truth. I don't see what I can do to help them, but with God all things are possible, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. The Lord of heaven and earth keep and bless you and your valuable work, is the earnest prayer of

Yours truly, MARIE ANNE CLARE.

CHIPCO, FLA., May 14th, 1885.

REV. JAS. A. O'CONNOR:

DEAR SIR:—We have just lent your "Letters to Cardinal McCloskey" and CONVERTED CATHOLIC to Rev. R. E. Ball, who studied for a priest, but is now pastor of the Oak Grove Baptist Church, Dade City, Fla. I presume you will hear from him.

Your friend and well-wisher,
FRED HACK.

DETROIT, MICHIGAN,
May 26th, 1885.

DEAR BROTHER:

Enclosed please find one dollar for my subscription to THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, in the hope that it may help you in your good work of preaching the Gospel to your compatriots. I am so interested in the perusal of your journal because your experience seems to be mine. I, too, from the reading of the Bible, left the Romish priesthood which I had in view, and became a minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Since then I have devoted myself to teaching the truth to my compatriots, the French people, who abound in the United States, and for whom so little is being done for their conversion. The Lord, my only support in temporal as in spiritual needs, has never failed me. Several hundreds have I had the pleasure of leading out of darkness into the marvellous light of the Gospel. Priests and monks have been given me to encourage me in such a hard undertaking of enlightening the poor Romanists. I have established six churches, mostly of converted Catholics, and I do not know that any ever went back to Rome, but all rejoice in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. I

had the pleasure of marrying Father Chiniquy in the beginning of his successful mission, which God has blessed so visibly in the conversion of our people. Keep on the good work and the Lord of the harvest will not fail you.

R. B. DESROCHES.

BINGHAMTON, N. Y.,
June 16th, 1885.

DEAR BROTHER O'CONNOR:

Miss Mary Ella McNany, a young girl sixteen years of age, born of Irish Roman Catholic parents, and residing at Seneca Falls, N. Y., was converted by members of the Salvation Army. Her mother forbade her to attend the meetings of the Army, and even used violence to prevent her. She went to Auburn, N. Y., to attend one of their conferences, and with some of their delegates came to this city about May 1st. Her parents learning she was here followed her, and armed with police authority made her a prisoner. She was at the time doing a good work and cried piteously when taken away, declaring that even if she were put in prison she would not return to the Catholic Church. At her departure from this place the Salvationists wept, and even cried aloud. She was a favorite with them, being attractive in person and manner, intelligent, a good singer, intensely religious and very successful in winning souls to Christ. She had placed herself under the guardianship of the Captain's wife, an excellent woman, and her conduct was perfectly consistent with her profession as a disciple of Christ.

She was taken to her home, and the Rev. Thomas Tousy, of the M. E. Church, Seneca Falls, called on her.

On his invitation she began to attend his church, and she was so persevering that her parents said they were willing she should join any church if she would stay at home. Brother Tousy has written to me that she had joined his church on probation. I know you will rejoice with many of us here who were earnest in prayer for that dear girl. I was apprehensive that she would be taken to a convent and pressure brought to bear on her to return to the Catholic Church, such pressure as you well know that Church is capable of. But fervent prayer on her behalf has prevailed, and to God be all the glory. I wish you would come to our city to preach and lecture for a week or two. The interest felt in the case of Miss McNany has been such that I know you would be heard gladly by many Protestants and Catholics. I am an aged local preacher of the M. E. Church, and most prayerfully wish you Godspeed in your great and good work.

Yours in Christ, A. M. F.

FREDONIA, WIS.,

June 14th, 1885.

REV. JAMES A. O'CONNOR:

DEAR SIR:—My parents, who emigrated from Germany to this country in 1852, were both Roman Catholics. I was born and reared in Ozaukee County, Wisconsin, the banner county for ignorance, superstition, bigotry and, needless to say, Romanism.

At an early age the key of Rome was placed in my hand, namely, the catechism, and in it I learned many absurd things, such as, the Roman Church is the only true Church. In my youth I had an unwavering faith in all her teachings, and while serving

mass, at eleven, it was my earnest desire to become a priest. But gradually as I grew older I noticed many things which seemed to me entirely contrary to Christianity. On one occasion while serving mass, for Rev. F——, he requested a friend and me to visit the neighboring communities, and collect all the money we possibly could in order to purchase him a clock and several other things. Well, we were both somewhat bashful, and could not refuse, and as I might say, we deemed it an honorable and memorable act on our part, to overrun the towns in the vicinity, begging for our rich priest.

Just as we were about to leave on our beneficent journey, the priest said, "Now, boys, if you see there are no hopes of obtaining money from certain families, and you think you might possibly receive some if you lie, why do so; the lie will be forgiven you in the confessional. Now, the more you collect the more blest you will be, as you will be contributing to the Lord's house."

With a troubled mind I left the church-yard that morning, knowing as I did, if I followed the advice of our supreme guide, the priest, I would be violating the sacred ten commandments. I resolved I would not tell a lie, and, let his pecuniary circumstances be what they may, I could plainly see that such an act could and would never be forgiven me, by such a disguised wolf in sheep's clothing. My friend and I worked earnestly that day and occasionally my friend would say, "I made use of the priest's advice, namely, 'to lie to get money'." The next day we returned, and with the collection bought our priest a clock.

The priests, as a general rule, feel themselves under no obligations to any one, and will always manage to succeed with their independent, despotic spirit. They feel that Christ himself is no greater than they, and so whatever they say or do is all true and right. Well, when we handed our priest his present he accepted it like an eighteen months' old babe, not even as much as thanking us for it. At another time while attending instruction, I found Rev. M——'s purse, which by the outer appearance seemed well supplied internally. Seeing him (the priest) in the church-yard, not far distant from where I found the purse, I went to him and inquired whether he had lost his purse? After feeling in all his pockets and searching them well, he said he had. With pleasure I handed him his beloved friend, and he too, like Rev. F——, knew not even enough to thank me for it, or if he did, he thought he, being a second Christ, was not obliged to thank me. Such are the priests of Rome, hypocritical characters, whom we are requested to follow under penalty of eternal damnation. Oh, is it possible that in this the nineteenth century there are people who still cling to these deluders and false prophets?

These two priests were pronounced the most devoted that the community ever had. Well, if we know that the best oranges in a box are foul and dirty, we can easily know what the others are. Well might Washington Irving have said, "The almighty dollar is the god of the Roman Catholic priest."

In my devotions, like all faithful Roman Catholics, I was accustomed to rapidly and thoughtlessly repeat the

many prayers of the Church. While serving mass, I was so used to bowing to images and pictures about the church, and especially about the altar, that when I would leave the morning services, to attend the public school, I would occasionally kneel before taking my seat. Sitting with a young Methodist, he asked me why I did that, when I was instantly reminded of my folly. It was probably through this boy that I am to-day a converted Catholic, for we often debated questions relating to the two Churches we belonged to. I was very anxious to learn something about my religion, in order to supply myself with sufficient information to enter into the debates with my comrade; but all was in vain, for the more I studied to strengthen myself, the weaker I became. Reading sketches like that of the shameful Pope Alexander VI., entirely broke me down. And when I attended the Normal School, at Valparaiso, Indiana, I occasionally would drop into the library and read the papers and magazine of the week. It was one morning while looking over the papers to find some interesting article, that I gazed on an outspread *New York Witness*, and at the top noticed the following title: "Father O'Connor's Letters to Cardinal McCloskey." This I must read, I thought, as it will most assuredly impart some thoughts to strengthen me; but to my surprise, it ended like many other articles which I had read to gain a strong foothold. All seemed to weaken rather than strengthen; but to-day I feel perfectly satisfied, for instead of weakening me in the "true religion," it strengthens me. How thankful I am now that I read the title, "Father O'Connor's

Letters to Cardinal McCloskey," that morning. After reading carefully all of the Letters to the Cardinal, and subscribing for *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*, I felt that I was on the right path and it was now my intention to make the Roman Church my study. With cool deliberation I considered some of the cardinal doctrines of the Church, such as the sacrifice of the mass, the use of images, the practice of praying to saints and pictures, the doctrine of purgatory, the necessity of confession to priests, the prohibition of marriage of the clergy, and the celebration of the mass in the Latin tongue, which was nowhere understood by the people. These I at length rejected, as I could find no warrant for them in the Scriptures: Beside these doctrines I studied the history of the gross abuses which the councils of the fifteenth century had attempted to remedy, and in which they partially succeeded.

Now, Father O'Connor, I have given you a brief account of my experience while a Roman Catholic.

YOUR CONVERTED CATHOLIC has given me more light on the doctrines of the Roman Church in one year than sixteen years' experience as a Catholic did. This small volume contains more useful information of its kind than all the sermons preached in the churches I have attended. I have not joined any Protestant denomination yet, because I am considering carefully what course to take and what the effects will be. My mother is very much displeased with the course I have thus far taken. She is pining away to think that her two sons are leaving the "only true Church." If she were not at heart

somewhat sympathetic she would have turned me out of doors a long time ago. But she entertains the idea that I will soon return to the Catholic faith, which I have not the least intention of doing. When I told her that I was a subscriber to your *Monthly* and would like very much for her to read its valuable pages, she said, "Who would ever have thought that my only two sons would ever be led astray by a priest who has left the Church?" and then she wept bitterly. I tried to console her, but she would not be consoled, but continued weeping for days, whenever I came in sight. Still when the opportunity is offered I generally direct our discourse toward *you*, and now she is gradually yielding, and I hope she will wholly renounce the Romish faith and accept the Bible way of salvation. Pray for all of us.

Your sincere friend,
P. J. CIGRAND.

ST. CHARLES, MINN.,
May 29th, 1885.

DEAR BROTHER IN CHRIST:

I will write you a few lines and tell you that I was a Roman Catholic, but for the last twenty years I have been a child of God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Oh! how I thank the Lord for those twenty years. You, brother, can rejoice with me. From your writings I know all about you these last five years. May God bless you and your good work is my prayer.

Your friend,
MRS. R. B. N.

We beg our readers to do us the favor of sending us the names, addresses and experiences of converted Catholics within their knowledge.

Roman Catholic Convents and American Institutions.

BY

REV. STEPHEN DEKINS, OF THE REFORMED CATHOLIC CHURCH.

It is one of the infirmities incident to human nature, that long-continued enjoyment of the highest blessings is apt to lessen them in our esteem.

This unhappy weakness displays itself not only with regard to the light of the sun and the beauties of nature, which we daily behold, but even in matters most vital to our religion and our liberty.

Is it not surprising that we should be so prone to undervalue the blessings of freedom and religious liberty which we possess? What a blessed condition of peace, prosperity and happiness it has been the lot of the inhabitants of this great nation to enjoy. When we pronounce the word America, our imagination pictures the land wherein may be found all that is most dear to the heart of man. Its well known lakes and streams, its mountains, valleys and plains become to us hallowed places, when we remember the heroes and legislators of old: George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, and others, who have dropped their pens and swords and stepped from the stage of action, transmitting the memory of their noble words and deeds as a priceless heritage to posterity. Every American should love his country as the seat of true religion, free from Popes, superstition and darkness; and he should cultivate that noble spirit which animated our fathers, who were men of mind and might, men who laid on the broad foundations of truth and

justice the grand superstructure of civil and religious freedom.

The mind of man is forever progressing, and no bounds can be set to the sphere of its operations. To what source may we look for valuable discoveries and multiplied inventions; for labor-saving machinery relieving the toiling masses; for colleges; for books and periodicals scattered like leaves of autumn all over our land; for art and science; for freedom of worship; and for a Church untrammelled by the fetters of State? To what may we look for all these things? To the free and enlightened mind of man.

The hope of this great republic is its open Bible and its free institutions. The former is the greatest educator known to man; the latter are the molds by which the coming generations may grow up into a perfect manhood and a powerful nation. These, then, are the foundation-stones of our republic. Take them away, and the peace and security of the community are destroyed, and moral corruption certainly ensues.

There is an organization in this country known as the Roman Catholic Church, with 8,000,000 followers. Its institutions are not in harmony with the free institutions of America, and by their very nature they never can be. As their strength increases they grow bold and defiant. I saw a picture some time ago, a picture without words. In it the goddess of Liberty appeared as the school-teacher, with a little boy by her side learning his lesson. This was the public school system. Down on the floor was what seemed to be a kitten, drinking milk from a saucer marked "Toleration." The supposed kitten had a ribbon

around its neck, on which was inscribed, "Romish influence." After showing it in various stages of growth, the kitten finally appears as a full-grown tiger, destroying the school-book, tearing the child, and standing on the prostrate form of Liberty.

There you have it, a picture without words. Look at Spain, with her Roman Catholic archbishops, 93 bishops, 50,000 priests, 14,000 monks, and 19,000 nuns; out of a population of 15,000,000 less than one million are able to read and write. Can you not understand the picture without words? Rome is a veritable tigress.

Said General Grant, after his trip around the world, "I have hopes of America, providing ignorance does not get the upper hand of intelligence. Keep ignorance down and we are safe." History in every age corroborates the experience of mankind in these days, that where men have no knowledge of the word of truth, there the masses, already slaves to their fellows, fall at once under the iron rule of an ecclesiastical despotism.

Madison said, "Without knowledge the blessing of liberty cannot be fully enjoyed or long preserved." We have already remarked that the mind of man was forever progressing and no limit can be set to the sphere of its operation. Let me recall to your memories the declaration of the doctrine of the Roman Church as set forth by the bishops of the Council of Cincinnati; that all men are not free; they are not created free nor equal; that those appointed to rule, such as kings, bishops and priests, have privileges that the people have not. And again where they speak of the American public schools, where many of their

priests received the first rudiments of education when their parents were too poor to send them to college. The educating influence of our American institutions has ennobled the hearts of our heroes, improved the minds of our statesmen, and strengthened the arms of our warriors. Those noble aspirations that make a nation of great men do not become clouded in our American institutions. Take away the Bible and these institutions, and place in their stead the Romish institutions, and ignorance and dynamite will run wild.

Popery is cunning. It aims to adapt itself to every age and nation, to become all things to all men, but its "infallible" guiding principle is ever the same. The pastoral letter that was sent out from the council at Baltimore hides the ferocious claws of a hateful system of despotism. Romanism is at our door, and the American people seem to know little or nothing about it. Many so-called Protestants, who claim to protest against Romish institutions, are contributing every year to their support, and are thus indirectly crushing the life out of their own churches.

Wherever this system has been allowed to operate in accordance with its true character, it has been invariably found destructive to human liberty. Romish institutions that have been a curse and a plague-spot across the Atlantic, where many of them have been suppressed, are now making their way to this country; one of them having made its appearance in Newark, New Jersey, being the only one of the kind in the United States at present. This is the Dominican Convent. I have been all through the building and can give a trustworthy account of this

institution. It is situated on Thirteenth Avenue and Ninth Street, and occupies an entire block. It is built in the form of a hollow square with the cloister proper in the centre. The material is dull-looking brown stone. It is surrounded by a high, thick wall. The chapel is very beautiful. In front of the altar is a Dominican cross. About fifteen feet above the altar is the exposition niche of the Sacrament, reached by steps curving from either side of the chapel. It is of Italian marble, exquisitely carved. From this elevated point the priest bestows benediction upon the people in the chapel, through a plate-glass window, which looks into the cloister to the assembled nuns. On a level with the floor and back of the altar, hidden from the gaze of the public, are iron grates with two small holes through which the communion is passed by the priest and partaken of by the Sisters. From one of the rooms of the priest opens a small dark closet into which the Father Confessor goes to hear the confessions of each Sister. She is locked in a similar room on the other side of the wall. Iron grates, sixteen inches apart, separate the Sister and Confessor. On the Sisters' side is a small iron frame perforated with very small holes. This fits the grating and through it she communicates with the priest. The wall separating the cloister from the world is very thick. Entrance is gained only through heavy doors. These doors are double-locked with keys of different make. One key is kept by the bishop or his representative, and the other by the prioress, so that no one can go in without the permission of both the prioress and the bishop.

Large community, or sitting and working-rooms are on the north side of the building, with large grated windows opening into a yard which may be reached by a door, which is, however, locked with the key in the possession of the prioress.

The Sisters' chapel, which is separated from the public chapel by a thick wall, is a cold-looking room provided with stalls, one for each sister. Opening from wide corridors are fifty rooms, nine by thirteen feet in size, generally, with one window, opening either into the court-yard or to the outside. Each of these rooms has a single cot-bed, a chair and table, and a bare floor. With the exception of the range in the kitchen there is only one fire allowed in the entire convent. The community or sitting-rooms where the Sisters work are two hundred feet away, and exposed to the cold of the north, with not a particle of heat from any source. Each Sister is absolutely under the control of the prioress and is not allowed to go near the fire except when sick. She must rise from bed, as the rules of the Order require, at midnight on a cold winter night, robed in the thin garments of the Order, and proceed to the chapel for devotion. There they remain two hours. At two o'clock in the morning the Sisters return to their beds and remain until six. About half of the day is spent in prayer and mortification of the flesh, and the remainder in work. The work engaged in is making fancy embroideries, vestments for priests and clothing for themselves. A rule of this Order is that not a particle of meat may be eaten from one year to another, unless sickness demands it. Special dispensation from

the bishop is required to allow a departure from this rule. The prioress of this prison-house is known in the world as Miss Julia Crooks, and is of a wealthy New York family. Her name has been changed since she entered the cloister to Sister Martha Mary Jesus, which is enough to shock the angels in heaven. Once within the cloister, the poor dupes are completely secluded and are allowed no communication whatever with the outer world. The order takes its name from "Saint" Dominic, who founded it about the year 1207. He was a cruel man and was the means of putting many persons to death. The familiars of the Holy Office, or Inquisition, belonged to the order of monks founded by this same *saint*.

Is it not strange, even if this is a free country, that such an institution should be allowed to exist in the United States, without being inspected at least once or twice a year? American institutions are *open* to inspection and *are* inspected. The State itself is not allowed to keep any one in prison without permitting inspection by the grand jury.

Romanism could not for a moment stand uncloaked before the bar of American public opinion. If America's testimony to-day is: "This is the land of liberty, and this liberty has for its foundation the Word of God," why not take every precaution to guard our liberty against sneak thieves who are working in secret to destroy it and to establish in its stead the bondage of Romanism? The great conflict is coming. Romanism is advancing and truth is advancing also. The Church of Rome is securing all the valuable land she can get for her

prison-houses and churches. Secretly and silently, behind the screen, she is waging a war upon our free institutions, upon a free press and a free pulpit. She purposes to build up, in this country, a power which dooms its victims to a system which fetters the conscience, and whose base tyranny shuts out the light of the Gospel.

This must be opposed. Peace to the ashes of our martyred dead, who fought and bled and fell for the establishment of universal liberty. Hallowed is the name of Abraham Lincoln, who stood at the head of our nation and whose heart yearned for the emancipation of the colored race. To-day, black and white find a strong arm of protection around them under our flag, and none are the children of the bondwoman, but of the free. General Grant has said, "If we are to have another contest in the future of our national existence, I predict that the dividing line will not be Mason and Dixon's; but it will be between patriotism and intelligence on one side, and superstition, ambition and ignorance on the other." The people of these United States may yet learn that the friend of Washington, General Lafayette, was a true prophet when he said, "American liberty can only be destroyed by popish priests." Romanism is united. She knows her strength. Therefore, it behooves Protestants to be united and stand shoulder to shoulder. Every year, I am sorry to say, many so-called Protestants are donating thousands of dollars for the support of Roman Catholic institutions. Remember, every dollar you give them is another nail in your own coffin. Does Rome give anything in return? I leave you to answer the question.

Will the time ever come (God forbid) that the Church of Rome shall plant on our shores the flagstaff that shall bear aloft the banner of her triumph? Garibaldi, in speaking of the Romish priests, said that they had changed the first of nations into one of the most abject, and "our unhappy and beloved Italy has become the very lowest in the social scale."

"These Romish priests," said he, "surround themselves with a profusion of luxury. Not only do we aim to free our beloved Italy, but also to free the entire world, from the dominion of the Papacy which everywhere opposes education, protects ignorance, and is the nurse of vice."

God raised up Martin Luther to unlock the storehouse of knowledge and to set free the Bible, which had been for so many ages laid away in the sepulchre and sealed from the view of the ignorant masses, who had been taught to look upon it as the work of the devil and the source of all heresies. But Luther rolled away the stone and cried aloud, as did Jesus at the grave of Lazarus, "Come forth."

From that day to this, Rome has never been able to capture and chain it again in her dark prison-houses, her monasteries, Dominican cloisters, etc., etc.

But she still hates the Bible, and the free institutions that have been created by the spread of the Gospel. The fagot, the rack and the stake would be in readiness to-morrow, if she only had the power she once had, and her champions do not hesitate to tell us so. Romanism never changes; it is ever the same; and we Reformed Catholics are laboring for the evangelization of those who sit in the darkness of that dangerous and deceptive religion, which is an enemy to all that is good and holy and pure and true. We mean, by the help of Almighty God, to stand by our principles, for free institutions, a free Bible, free press, free pulpit and free speech.

"Here we stand. We cannot do otherwise. God help us. Amen."

THE CHURCH OF ROME

EVIDENTLY PROVED

Heretick.

BY DR. PETER BERAULT,

Who abjured all the Errors of the said Church in London at the Savoy upon the 2d day of April, 1671.

They are Hereticks who know more than the Scripture teacheth.—IRÆNEUS, Book V., 6, 17.

London: Printed by Tho. Hodgkin for the Author. MDCLXXX.

V.

Sly, it is also contrary to reason, *first* because it supposes the same Body in several places at one time; a body may be considered objectively at one time in several places, but that it should be physically or substantially in many places at one time altogether, as the Church of Rome would have, which saith and obligeth to believe that the Body of Jesus Christ is substantially in Heaven, and Earth, and in every place, where the Priest pleaseth to Consecrate, or pronounce these words, this is my Body, this is my Blood; and in every part of the Consecrated Bread, so that if you divide it into a thousand parts, it is there in every part wholly: it is that which is contrary to reason, because according to reason, a body of six foot in dimension, cannot occupy no more place, than the circumference of six foot, and though it may be successively in several places, yet it cannot at the same time.

And these words of Peter, whom the Heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, prove my sayings evidently. For if his Body be in Heaven, and that he hath a true Body (as all men know he hath) how

can it be that it should be both in Heaven and in Earth, as touching his Body, at one time ? for though he have a glorified Body, yet he retaineth the nature and property of a true Body still, which can be but in one place at once, and so saith Austin, *Corpus Domini in quo resurrexit, uno tantum loco esse potest*; The Body of the Lord wherein he rose again, can be but in one place only.

Secondly, It is against reason, because it maketh Accidents exist without any Subject; it is the nature of Accidents to be joyned to their Subject as for example, it is the nature of the whiteness of a stone to be joyned to the stone, so that if you destroy the nature or substance of the stone, you must of necessity destroy its whiteness, and other its Accidents, and according to the opinion of modern Philosophers, who say that Accidents are nothing else than matter modified, that is to say, as it is disposed to this or that fashion, it followeth that Matter cannot be destroyed without its Accidents being destroyed likewise with it. It is the opinion of Iræneus, who saith that we cannot consider water, without its humidity, nor fire without heat, nor a stone, without hardness; these things being so united, that the one cannot be without the other, but that they must exist together. And the Church of Rome teacheth the contrary, for in their mystery of Transubstantiation, they put the Accidents without any subject; they put colour and quantity without matter, smell and taste without substance; hardness and humidity without there being any thing that is hard and moist, which I may very well say or affirm is contrary to reason.

Ninthly, Likewise it is contrary to the holy Fathers; they say that the Eucharist Consecrated is Bread, such as we eat and which satisfieth the Belly. Theodoret saith, *Neque enim signa mystica post Sanctificationem recedunt á natura sua, manent enim in priore substantia, figura & forma, & videri & tangi possint sicut prius*, that is, The mystical signs after consecration do not depart from their nature, for they abide still in their former substance, figure and form, and may be both seen and felt as before.

The same Theodoret saith, that Jesus Christ hath honoured the visible Symbols with the name of his Body and Blood, not in changing their nature, but in adding grace to it.

Chrysostome saith that the mystical Symbols do not lose their proper nature, but remain in their first substance, as the Body of Christ hath preserved the true substance of a Body, when it was glorified.

And Pope Gelasius saith, that the Consecrated Bread is honoured with the name of the Body of the Lord, and yet the nature of Bread remaineth in it; *non desinit, inquit, substantia vel natura Panis & Vini; & certe, Imago & similitudo Corporis & Sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum Corporis Christi Celebratur*. The substance, saith he, or nature of Bread and Wine doth not cease, and verily there is the Image and Similitude of the Body and Blood of Christ celebrated in the action of the mysteries of the body of Christ.

Origines saith thus, the Bread that is Sanctified with the word of God, as touching the material substance thereof, goeth into the belly, and forth again like other meats.

Chrisostome writing to the people of Antioch saith, God giveth us things spiritual under things visible and natural; and again, being Sanctified, it is delivered from the name of Bread, and is exalted to the name of the Lord's Body, although the nature of the Bread still remaineth.

Justin Martyr, Bishop of Lion, saith, that our flesh is nourished with the Cup, which is the Blood of Christ, and is increased with the Bread which is the Body of Christ. This passage destroyeth those of the Roman Church, who, because they believe that the Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, are compelled to say that our Body is not nourished with the Bread and Wine, but with their Accidents, or by some Substance that God createth.

Tertullian saith, Jesus Christ took the Bread, and giving it to his Disciples made it his Body, saying this is my Body, that is to say, (saith Tert.) the figure of my Body.

And Austin saith, Non dubitavit dominus dicere, hoc est Corpus meum, cum daret signum Corporis sui. The Lord doubted not to say, this is my Body, when he gave but the sign of his Body.

Christi miranda patientia adhibuit Judam ad convivium, in quo Corporis & Sanguinis sui figuram discipulis tradit. The admirable patience of Christ, (saith Austin) admitted Judas to the banquet, wherein he delivered to his Disciples the figure of his Body and Blood.

He saith that the Sacraments are called by the name of the things they represent.

The Sacrament then of the Lord's Supper may be taken either conjunc-

tively with what it represents, and in this sense it is said to be the Body and Blood of Christ; or separately from the things which it signifieth, and in this sense, it is the type, the symbole, or figure of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ: and that is to be seen in the affairs of the World, where we say the letters which are brought, wherein is contained the pardon, which the King giveth to a Criminal, are the Kings pardon.

Baronius saith, that Theodore, Bishop of Rome, for the Condemnation of Pyrus, and the Council held at Constantinople for the Condemnation of Photius, took the Consecrated Cup, and poured ink into it, and having dipped their Pens into these two mixt liquors, they subscribed the Depositions of these men. If they had believed that the consecrated Wine was the blood of Jesus Christ, as now the Church of Rome believeth, is it credible that they would have mixt ink with it, and dipped their Pens in it? no, it is not to be believed, for the Church of Rome would not do so now, but would believe they should commit an horrible Sacrilege.

That which confirms all that I am about to alledge from the Fathers against the pretended mystery of Transubstantiation, is, that when they disputed against Idolaters, they confuted them with these words; why do ye adore what your hands have made, and which hath neither speech, nor motion, and which is subject to fire, and to corruption, and to be stolen away by Thieves? If at that time, they had believed that Jesus Christ had been under the Accidents of Bread and Wine, and if the fathers had taught that Doctrine, it is most certain

the Idolaters would have retorted their argument, and have said, that the God which they adored in the Bread was a work of their own hands, which hath neither speech, nor motion but was subject to corruption, to fire, and to be stolen away; But we do not find they made such an Answer. Therefore it is a sign that this Doctrine was not taught by the fathers, but was contrary to them. Moreover if they had believed transubstantiation, that is to say, the changing of the Bread and Wine into the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, they would not have failed to instruct us that a body is under a point, that it hath Accidents without any Subject; that it is after the manner of a Spirit; they would have taught us what nourishes our bodies in the receiving of the Sacrament, and from whence come the worms which are ingendered in the Bread; they would have told us what kind of action it is which maketh Christ exist under the Species of Bread and Wine; whether it was a Reproduction, or Adduction, or Ubification? I say they would have taught us all these things, since the Church of Rome giveth now a particular Instruction in it: now since they were as wise and learned as the present Doctors of the Church of Rome now, and since they said nothing of it, it is a mark that this Doctrine was contrary to their opinion.

And when they disputed against the Marcionites and Euticheens the former of which believed that Jesus Christ had not a true Body, but only an appearance; and the latter that the substance of his body was changed into the Godhead after his Resurrection; they alledged these words of our Lord, handle me and see for a Spirit hath

no flesh and bones as ye see me have. If they had believed that in the Lords Supper the Accidents had continued without the substance of Bread and Wine (as the present Church of Rome believes) the Marcionites would not have failed to alledge this example to prove that the senses perceived in Jesus Christ an appearance of a body without a reality, as they did see in the Lords Supper an appearance of Bread and Wine when they were not really there. But so it is that they did never alledge such an example, therefore I may truly say that this was not the belief of those times, and that it was contrary to the opinion of the antient Fathers.

And to shew you the right father of transubstantiation, it was one of the dreams of Innocentius the third in the year of our Lord 1215. So many years passed before Transubstantiation was named, and then a Pope set it first on foot, so it came out of Rome, and for want of Scriptures hath been defended with Fire and Sword.

You see then that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is contrary to the holy Scriptures; and since notwithstanding the Roman Church doth believe it, it is evident they add to the word of God, and think above that which is written, and therefore they are Heretick.

(To be continued.)

MR. FRANCIS J. WALDRON, whose letter giving his reasons for abandoning Romanism appeared in our last issue, has been with us for the last two months studying the Sacred Scriptures and preparing for the work of an evangelist to his Roman Catholic brethren. He is a bright young man, and we expect good results from his labors in this movement.

THE MORAL THEOLOGY OF THE JESUITS.

Translated for THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC from the Latin Text of Father
J. P. Gury, of the Society of Jesus, Professor of Moral Theology
in the Roman College.

ARTICLE I. Different Systems of Probabilism.

Rigorism: according to which the safer opinion should always be followed. This system is in favor of every law unless when certainty favors exemption. Mitigated rigorism: according to which it is allowable to follow a more probable opinion in favor of exemption. Greater probabilism: according to which an opinion in favor of a law must be followed, unless the contrary opinion is much more probable.

Equal probabilism: according to which it is allowable to follow a less safe opinion, unless it is as probable (or nearly so) as the contrary opinion. Probabilism: according to which a less safe and less probable opinion may be followed if the probability on which it rests is really strong.

Laxity: according to which it is always permitted to act on even slightly probable opinions.

Of its nature probabilism excludes moral certitude. However great probability may be, it is displaced when a contrary opinion becomes certain. We can safely regard any opinion as probable which is so regarded by most theologians, or even held as positively true by five or six who are distinguished by their integrity, sound judgment and knowledge, unless it is opposed to a known certainty.

A learned and upright man may hold as probable an opinion which he has carefully examined and deems true (or certainly probable), for weighty reasons, provided he has not been swayed by any unworthy consideration. Only really learned and long-experienced theologians can pronounce upon the intrinsic probability of any law, since they alone know that no solid objections can be brought against their decision. A moderately learned man may form a judgment about the extrinsic probability of an opinion if, knowing well the actual state of the question, he finds it sanctioned by the authority of eminent theologians. A single author of unquestioned authority who brings forward a reason that others have not examined or sufficiently explained, and who deals in detail with the reasons of his opponents, can establish a safely probable opinion even though it may be contrary to the one that is usually followed. An unlearned person who hears one whom he regards as upright, prudent and learned state that an opinion is safely probable, may regard it as such. He can not form a judgment about it himself and has no other means of determining its extrinsic probability.

ARTICLE II. Efficacy of Probabilism in forming a Conscience.

This efficacy consists in the power of probabilism to shape a practically certain dictate of conscience.

FIRST THESIS.

It is not allowable to follow a probable nor even a more probable opinion that puts aside a safer one whenever a person is bound to attain a certain end, the attainment of which might be jeopardized by the use of probably unsuitable means.

SECOND THESIS.

It is not allowable to discard a safer opinion in favor of a slightly probable one.

THIRD THESIS.

When the uprightness alone of an act is in question, it is allowable to follow the most probable, or even the more probable opinion, setting aside a safer one.

FOURTH THESIS.

Whenever that which is forbidden or not is alone in question, it is allowable to follow the most probable or even the more probable opinion, taking no notice at all of a safer one. There is no obligation to obey any law the existence of which is uncertain; but the existence is clearly uncertain, if a real and solid probability stands against it. Accordingly, a person is not bound to give up a probable in order to follow a safer opinion.

ARTICLE III. Use of Probabilism.

Besides the general principles that constitute the theory of Probabilism, to wit: "No obligation can be imposed if there be any doubt about it," or "No doubtful law is obligatory"—some special rules which confirm these principles are to be applied in particular instances.

1. Presumption is sufficient to decide a case of doubt. 2. What usually happens should determine a doubtful judgment. 3. In case of doubt about the performance of an act, it should generally be presumed that the act has been performed. Yet this principle ought to be used in favor of exemption, unless the contrary presumption is strong, or the good of the state or of religion forbids it. 4. In cases of doubt, mild judgments are to be preferred; favorable ones welcomed, and adverse or severe ones to be avoided as much as possible. 5. In obscure cases, the least onerous part may always be taken. 6. In case of doubt a fact can never be presumed; it should be proven: that which ought to be in conformity with law, is supposed to be: no man should be held wicked without clear proof of his guilt. 7. In cases of doubt the safer opinion should be followed, but this rule ought to be confined to cases of practical doubt. As to speculative doubt, no rule is laid down; advice only can be given.

When there are several probable opinions, it is allowable to follow anyone of them (or its contradictory) on different occasions. . . .

[Such, in brief, is the entire doctrine of Probabilism—"A deplorable doctrine," says the Bishop of Rhodes, "which is the source of all corruption in the moral laws and has cast great opprobrium on religion. Our enemy sowed its seed in the obscurity of their schools whilst pastors were asleep." . . .

It is easy to see, as well from the preceding as from the following part of our translation, that the Jesuits have not abandoned a single point of their abominable doctrines. The old Jesuits have written on the same subject—

Henriquez says (p. 9): "A scrupulous person is quite right who chooses that which he deems a probable opinion, even though another opinion may seem more probable. Every confessor should (even against his own opinion) conform to the opinion of his penitent, provided it can be excused before God."

John of Salas says: "It is allowable to follow the most probable, although the least safe opinion; it is also allowable to take the less safe side in a case of equal probabilism."

And again: "A religious should have the strongest motives for believing any revelation by which God dispenses him from the vow of celibacy. Hitherto, God never granted any such dispensation; yet in order to avoid worry (if the probability be real), he may avail himself of a doubtful or merely probable dispensation."

John de Salas (p. 11) says: "A confessor can absolve a penitent who holds an opinion opposed to his own (even though it be less safe) whether it is hurtful to others or not, provided it is probable."

Under similar circumstances, Sotus thinks that a confessor CAN and OUGHT to absolve every such penitent.

Gregory of Valence (p. 14) says: "The question is asked whether a Judge can, without respect of persons, decide a case (about the legal aspects of which authorities do not agree) in favor of a personal friend, on a probability which is equally strong for each side. If the Judge thinks the contradictory opinions equally probable, he can certainly decide in favor of his friend; to do him a service, he could even combine both opinions in his decision, resting its different parts on one and the other alternately—provided he can avoid giving scandal."

Gilles de Coninck writes: "Whenever theologians are divided on any point, we can follow whichever opinion we please (even though it be the least safe and the least probable), provided it is really probable."

Vasquez (p. 21) teaches: "An illiterate person may follow any opinion which he thinks probable (if he knows that it is held by experienced and upright people), even though it may not be the safest nor the best known. Sylvester says that an illiterate man can follow the opinion of his master or confessor."

Laymann writes: "A theologian can advise any one who consults him, not alone according to his own personal view, but also according to the opposite and probable opinion of others (if the latter is more pleasing and favorable to the consulting party), even though he is fully convinced that this opinion is so theoretically false that he dare not adopt it himself. Hence it follows that a

theologian can treat different persons to conflicting opinions that rest on opposite but equal probabilities. He should, however, at all times act discreetly and prudently in these matters."

Filliucius (p. 29) says: "The authority of a theologian who is an upright and learned man, renders any opinion probable, because it affords considerable security in forming a decision."

Escobar (p. 35) writes: "When I consider the many different opinions that are held in moral law, I must think them a happy dispensation of Providence. Such diversity helps us to carry more willingly the yoke of our Saviour. Providence has ordained various ways to follow in all our actions, so that the same act can be good whether it is in conformity with a certain opinion or with a contrary one. It is allowable to consult different theologians until a man finds one according to his own heart, if he fairly intends to discover somewhere a probable opinion in his favor and is determined to do nothing against the dictate of a probable conscience."

Busenbaum is even more outspoken: "People who consult theologians until they find one who suits them, ought not to be blamed if he is prudent, pious, and no—crank."

Tambourin (p. 38) writes: "These ignorant confessors are to blame who always oblige penitents to make restitution on the ground that it is always safer to do so. If such penitents merely wanted to know what is safer, they would not invite any opinion; they would make restitution without asking a question at all."

De Lugo teaches: "Whenever there is question of determining whether a penitent is bound to make restitution if he get safely through with such or such a contract, a confessor should follow his penitent's opinion (if it be a probable one), and give him absolution."

Louis de Scildere (p. 41) writes: "An inferior who believes that probably his superior has no jurisdiction should not obey him, even though he actually holds office. In the same way, an inferior who thinks that the order of a superior exceeds the limit of his authority, need not obey it; and a culprit who has a probable opinion that his Judge is not asking lawful questions is not bound to answer."

George of Rhodes says: "Any good reason is sufficient for a probable opinion, and certainly the authority of a famous and pious theologian is a good reason. Hence the authority of one such theologian is enough to render an opinion probable."

Terille (p. 56) says: "As a general rule in faith and morals every one is at liberty to adopt the least probable and safe opinion, even though he deems a contrary one more probable and safer and that it is so in reality; but the agent must certainly consider his opinion practically probable."

Gobat (p. 56) accepts and develops this doctrine but is more naive; putting aside Terille's reserve, he declares with Oviedo: "Every speculatively probable opinion is also practically probable."

Fabri maintains (p. 64): "Any two conflicting opinions that are really

probable, are equally safe both in theory and practice. It is allowable to follow a less probable moral opinion if its probability is certain. The opinion that permits us to follow the least probable opinion is itself the most probable one." [This is justly considered exceedingly clever hair-splitting.]

Casnedi (p. 67) holds: "It is always permitted to follow the least safe and least probable opinion, without paying any attention to the stronger speculative probability of a contrary one which is safer in every respect. This is always true when the least safe and probable opinion is yet quite safe and practically probable."

Lacroix (p. 100) teaches: "It is allowable to act according to what is probable (even when an opposite opinion is more probable) and to follow a less probable opinion, not alone in cases of positive human law, but also in matters that appertain to the natural and divine laws."

Muszka (p. 103) writes: "If two different opinions that are certainly probable be met with in the moral law, a person is not always bound to follow the more probable and safer one; consequently, he may occasionally follow the less safe and probable."

Matignon in the "*Études Religieuses*" (1866) says: "It is well known that Father Gury's two works have greatly helped to popularize amongst the clergy of France, the mildest solutions of Probabilism."]

CASES OF CONSCIENCE.

CASE VII. Probabilism.

Philibert, a professor of theology, has found fault with every known system of probabilism and devised one for himself by which he undertakes to solve every difficulty. He assumes that a doubtful law is neither void of obligation nor obligatory; it binds us more or less, according to our knowledge of it and there is always some obligation, because there is continual danger of infringing a positive law. Yet if a law be more or less binding (according to our knowledge of it), the reason that dispenses us from obedience should be measured by the gravity of the obligation to be incurred. What should be thought of this system?

Philibert seems to take it for granted that it is forbidden to run the risk of breaking a law which is not clearly understood. This assumption is unwarranted. What harm can there be in a breach of law when a person is ignorant of his obligation? Or can sin be unknowingly committed? Besides, this system leads to views that are condemned. Once admitted, a probable opinion could no longer be followed; for even after choosing the safer part, the danger of breaking a law would still continue. Moreover, such a violation (even if it did occur) could not be regarded as voluntary; it would simply result from ignorance.

CASE IX. Authority of Confessors with regard to Opinions.

L. goes to confession and is asked by his confessor: "Have you made

such or such a contract?" His answer is: "Yes, sir, but many other good men do the same with the full consent of holy and learned priests." "Oh, that is not at all my view of the matter," says this Confessor; "you must break this contract or indemnify the other party to it." "Well, sir, since other honest and well-informed men see no harm in it, I think that probably it is allowed." "I don't think so," says the priest; "so you must find some other confessor, for I cannot absolve you."

L. tells another priest how he has been treated. "Don't worry yourself," said this latter; "I don't think your opinion a probable one, but as it is regarded as such by learned theologians, you are entitled to hold it and I will give you absolution." Did this confessor act rightly?

A confessor cannot allow his penitent to follow a wrong opinion or practice a false doctrine, and should shield him from error; but if a penitent chooses to follow a probable opinion that is sanctioned by distinguished theologians, his confessor has no right to prevent him.

Every opinion that is held by five or six theologians (remarkable for moderation, uprightness and learning), that has never been condemned and is neither opposed to any actual law nor to sound reason, may be regarded as probable and can never be set aside by an ordinary confessor.

[*"Whenever a confessor has reason to believe that his advice will not be followed, he should hold his tongue."*—Jean Marin, S. J., p. 125.]

CASE XI. Change of Opinion.

Relying on a probable opinion, Lucian regards as valid a will made in his favor, although he knew that it was not legal in form; soon after he succeeded in setting aside a will similarly drawn up in favor of Caius. When is such a change of opinion allowed? How should Lucian be dealt with?

It is allowable to change an opinion whenever the change is in harmony with real probability. Whoever embraces either of two probable opinions does not regard the other as improbable; he still remains uncertain and may adopt it, should he find it to his advantage.

Lucian was justified in his change of mind. He had a probable opinion in each case and acted rightly; though he followed only a probable opinion in the first instance, he did not regard the contrary opinion as improbable, and had every right to test it in a court of law.

[Tambourin (p. 38) writes: "It is probable that money can compensate for loss of character; and it is also probable that it cannot; consequently, a person whose character has been blackened by another is justified in demanding monetary satisfaction and is equally justified in refusing like satisfaction to another whose character he has injured."]

THIS TRANSLATION OF THE MORAL THEOLOGY OF THE JESUITS IS THE most important that has appeared in the English language. Our subscribers should supply their pastors with it. We can send back numbers for 50 cents to the end of the year.

FATHER O'CONNOR'S LETTERS TO CARDINAL McCLOSKEY.

Second Series.

LETTER VIII.

NEW YORK, July 22d, 1885.

SIR:

In the discussion of the "Freedom of Worship" bill in the Legislature of this State last March, Senator Michael C. Murphy said, "I state that Charles P. Daly, Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas of New York, and President of the Historical Society, is about the same kind of a Catholic as I am myself. He is a nominal Catholic." And in the New York papers of July 16th, 1885, appears an interview with State Senator Dennis McCarthy, of Syracuse, N. Y., concerning the election of State officers next Fall. Mr. McCarthy said: "The statement that 'in the eyes of certain people a Catholic Governor of this State would be a misfortune, though a Catholic for the second place on the ticket would be tolerated' is all bosh. Now, I am a candidate for the office of Lieutenant Governor if General Carr (another Catholic) is not nominated for Governor. If he should be nominated for the first place on the ticket, I should refuse to be a candidate for the second place, because I do not think that the people want two men who are at least nominal Catholics to head the ticket. I do not, of course, know how strong a Catholic General Carr is, but from all I can learn he is more devoted to the Church than I am. It is true that I am not a practical Catholic, but I have an Irish name and Irish sympathy, and am very liberal in my religious views."

We have here, Cardinal, an authoritative statement from representative men of what a "nominal Catholic" is. An "Irish name" and "Irish sympathy" go a great way towards making a man a Catholic. It is not a question of religion at all, for religion is "the recognition of God as an object of worship, love, and obedience." A "nominal Catholic" has generally very liberal views, like Senator McCarthy, except where the special interests of your Church are concerned. "Very liberal religious views," mean no religious convictions whatever. Nominal Catholics do not really believe in your Church; as they privately say, "We have outgrown the superstitions of our Irish parents;" but they will not risk their positions, their business and social relations, by saying so publicly. Such men are highly esteemed by certain Protestants whose "religious views" are equally liberal, and who will support every movement that is calculated to advance the interests of your Church, because there are so many "liberal" men connected with it. Though men like Messrs. Murphy, McCarthy and Carr are not "practical" Catholics and laugh in their sleeves at your superstitions, you will not cast them out of your Church. Oh, no! They are too useful to you. It is only when men give utterance to the honest convictions of the heart in proclaiming another and safer way of salvation than you afford that you anathematize and persecute them. And yet there are many of "Irish name and Irish sympathy" who are boldly confronting your superstitious teachings, more in this generation than at any period since the Reformation of the sixteenth century. The testimonies of the "Converts from Rome" that I am publishing in successive numbers of this Monthly give

evidence of this. And I transfer to this place one of the most striking articles in this connection that I have seen in a long time. It is an editorial article from the *Cambridge* (Mass.) *News* of a recent date. Mr. D. A. Buckley, the editor of the *News*, is a man of "Irish name and Irish sympathy," and yet he writes as follows :

"AN APOSTATE OF THE APOSTATES."

Frequently in private, and occasionally in the *Cambridge Press*, the epithet of "Apostate," "Renegade," etc., is hurled at us as though it was a mighty engine of destruction which should immediately crush us to earth, from which it would be impossible for us ever to rise again.

What does all this mean?

It means that we were born of Catholic parents and in our early years trained in that faith, a faith which we discarded shortly after attaining our majority, and for doing which the Catholic portion of this parish (with a few honorable exceptions), led on by their pastors, have in season and out attempted, at first in their sly Jesuitical, and later, open manner, attempted to persecute us to the extent of the scope of their ability and power, which is far greater than an outsider can have any conception of.

When we were between eleven and twelve years of age we were appointed an assistant teacher of the first class of the "Old Cathedral" Sabbath-school, then in Franklin street, Boston. We were probably looked upon as a budding disciple and future defender of the faith, and an elder bachelor brother tendered his financial aid towards securing us a collegiate education on the *condition* that we should destine ourself for the priesthood. We agreed to accept his aid but not on the condition.

Why, if we desired an education, did we not agree to the condition?

Because, even at that early age we had serious doubts of the soundness of the claims of the Church, which in our opinion savored of the preposterous.

We thought that perhaps our doubts were due to our youthful ignorance, and we sought, but failed, to obtain satisfactory light.

We could not believe that the Protestant youth who sat by our side at school, who possessed all the virtues in the decalogue, added to an angelic disposition, was to suffer the torments of the damned forever and forever because he was born a Protestant, for which he was no more responsible than for the color of his hair or skin, while the wild, untamed, untamable "hell-hound" who sat in front of him and constantly violated all laws human and divine, was destined to hold a high seat in heaven by the right of reversion, because he was born in the Catholic faith and believed in its doctrines, founded on his theological ignorance, which the Church fostered and enforced by tabooing and forbidding all literature which would tend to open his mental vision or awaken his dormant faculties.

We could not believe that a brutal priest, the offspring of a brutal and ignorant parentage, whose pathway to the "sacred college" was paved with the illgotten gains derived from the debauchery and wickedness of others, because a certain shibboleth had been pronounced at his ordination, which is supposed to have exorcised all the evil deeds committed by himself and ancestors, transmitted to and inherited by him, could literally perform the miracle of turning simple bread and fermented wine into the literal body and blood of Christ, or that of any man, unless his or their blood was composed of different ingredients from any known to science, religion or law.

We could not understand how the patricide, robber, red-handed murderer and gallows-bird, having been satiated with or condemned for his numerous crimes, could, upon receiving "extreme unction," pass on to the realm of bliss prepared for the cherubs and angels of the Lord.

In our readings we found abundance of evidence to prove that, if the Catholic Church was founded or built upon a rock, it must have been an extremely mossy one, as it has several times slipped from its foundation and shifted its moorings.

Their entire theological system is based upon the submission of the ignorant many to the intelligent few, who maintained their supremacy by those superstitious rites grafted on Christianity by paganism, to which were added from time to time diableries of their own.

We, with the slight insight we had obtained in our endeavor to secure information to confound others outside of the fold, could not stop where we landed, but groped our way out of the wilderness or maze in which we had been born and bred into the outer light and air, from which we concluded never to return to the mental chains or trammels which had bound us.

We did not desire to court the revengeful feelings of the Catholics which our new course would necessarily entail. We knew that in their eyes we had committed the only unpardonable sin in their calendar, and that hereafter we would be looked upon by the majority as worse than a red-handed murderer; we therefore quietly withdrew and for thirty years have not seen the inside of a Catholic church save in the way of business, and in that manner but a few times.

For years we left the Church severely alone until Father Scully commenced to organize his forces against us and held a caucus in his church to defeat us when running for a local office.

We had been informed by Catholics and politicians that we could wield the entire political power of the parish if we would but attend their seances—a price too high for us to pay. They were mistaken in their man. Whatever feeling of regard we may entertain for many of his people and dupes, we do not entertain a particle for priests of the Scully or Mundy breed, but have an unutterable contempt for their forms of belief or incantations.

We believe the Catholic religion to be a blight upon any nation under its sway and a curse to the people who put their faith and trust in it.

We believe the Catholic Church to be the greatest show and humbug on earth, Barnum's not excepted, and the greatest foe to intellectual and civil progress and civilization.

Living we will shun it, dying we do not desire any of its ministrations, and dead we do not desire that any of their idiotic incantations be delivered over our remains or grave.

We say this calmly, coolly, deliberately, in the fulness and prime of our manhood, with all our faculties unimpaired.

We expect and receive many manifestations of its hatred.

We know that we are not to expect any peace of any name or nature which they and theirs can prevent.

They have interfered with our employés. They have boycotted us to the extent of their power. They have refused the sacrament to Catholics for the sole reason that they visited our office, and one of the most intelligent among them alleged that "we should be content that they permitted us to live," which they probably would not in a Catholic country ruled by Irish Catholics, the most ignorant, superstitious and blindly obedient of any on God's footstool.

They may boycott, anathematize, excommunicate if they will—we are content; but we do not intend to permit them to place violent hands upon us with impunity. When they attempt that we shall defend ourself as best we can. They can rest assured that we cannot be driven or coerced.

God bless and prosper Mr. Buckley and all other converted Catholics is the prayer of

Yours truly,

JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

ROME: PAGAN AND PAPAL.

(Continued from Page 256.)

CHAPTER XIII.

USE OF CHARMS IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

PART II.

We will now adduce a few more instances of the use of amulets.

Just as Sylla, the Dictator (d. B.C. 68), consulted a little Apollo hung round his neck, so Pope Gregory XIV. (A.D. 1590) put his trust in a figure of St. Philip Neri, "by which image he believed that his life was saved in an earthquake at Beneventum."—Hare's *Rome*, vol. ii., p. 168.

In Spain, during the age of chivalry, a knight was not allowed to enter the lists until he had made a declaration that he had no relic or charm upon him. Ford, in his *Handbook for Spain*, informs us that even now, few Spanish soldiers go into action without such a preservative; that the Duchess of Abrantes hung the Virgin del Pilar round the neck of her favorite bull-fighter, who escaped in consequence; and that Jose, his own guide, attributed his frequent escapes from danger to an image of the Virgin which never quitted his shaggy breast.

Spanish robbers, Ford adds, have always been "remarkably good Roman Catholics." They, too, wear their charms; while "Italian banditti always wear a silver heart of the Madonna."—Vol. ii., p. 192.

In the *Times* of Sept. 21st, 1879, the Naples correspondent wrote as follows:

"The fanatics, who are the observers of the superstitions practised in Naples, are those who supply the most abundant materials for the police courts. Crime and superstition go hand in hand. The brigands who were taken red-handed in this province were invariably found to have rosaries and relics around their necks."

I remember a painful example of this confidence in amulets at Devonport a few years ago, in a case in which it would not have been expected. It was that of an aged and well-known clergyman, who on his death-bed held a consecrated medal with the greatest tenacity.

"Mary," said a Protestant minister to a sick convert from Romanism, "what are you doing?" She had been fumbling with something under the bedclothes while he was reading the Scriptures, and made no reply to the question. It was, however, repeated, and at last the truth came out in the shape of some medals and other consecrated toys, which she had been keeping about her. "And must I give them up?" she said in a pitiful voice. "Yes," he replied, "Christ will not share your heart with idols."

But this case is surpassed by that of two educated English ladies of my

acquaintance who were not satisfied unless they had a crucifix in their bed—I suppose as a charm!

The following story, which I heard from an Indian judge, is a good instance of the trust which superstitious minds put in these charms. About forty years ago, my friend stayed at Rome on his way to the East, and presented a letter of introduction to Bishop Baggs, honorary chaplain to the Pope. He had frequent intercourse with the bishop, who evinced great anxiety to win him to "the true faith," and on one occasion said, "Will you wear this medal for nine days, while I and others pray for your conversion?" Some virtue in the medal was to dispose him to conversion; but it did not, and he remains a good Protestant up to the present time.

The following extract from Sterling's *Cloister Life of Charles V.* illustrates the influence of charms on a great mind.

"Towards eight in the evening," his chronicler relates, "Charles asked if the consecrated tapers were ready. 'The time is come,' said he; 'bring in the candle and the crucifix.' These were cherished relics which he had long kept in readiness for the supreme hour. The one was a taper from Our Lady's shrine at Monserrat; the other a crucifix which had been taken from the dead hand of his wife at Toledo. He received them eagerly from the Archbishop, Carranza, the Primate. . . . On his bosom was placed the crucifix of the Empress, and at the head of the bed hung a beautiful picture of our blessed Lady."

So died the great Emperor!

The lamented Prince Napoleon had—as a Roman Catholic soldier commonly would—a charm upon him when he was killed by the Zulus. It was a medal of the Madonna; and a London newspaper stated that the Zulus would not detach it from his neck, because they believe that "charms," if removed from the last wearer, bring his luck with them.

It is recorded that the Duke of Monmouth, when taken prisoner at Sedgemoor, was found to have similarly fortified himself with several charms tied about his body; while his "table book"—purchased in this century at a book-stall in Paris, and now in the British Museum—is filled with songs, recipes, prayers, and charms. But all did not avail to save him from defeat and the block.

A good story connected with our subject is told by a correspondent of the *Times* in a letter dated Rome, May 26th, 1879. It relates to one of the then newly-made Cardinals, Monsignor Pie, the well-known Bishop of Poitiers—the man who denounced Napoleon III. as Pontius Pilate, was most active in recruiting the Antibes Legion for the Papal army, and supported Pio Nono in his most ultramontane measures. Here it is:

"An amusing story is told of Pie's having ordered a grand funeral mass for a Pontifical Zouave who was supposed to have fallen at Castel Fidardo—of his having extolled in glowing language the exalted virtues and heroism of the defunct, whom all should strive to imitate; while the man himself was in the church, attending his own funeral ceremony.

"At the end of the service, however, the man was arrested as a runaway debtor, to the scandal of all good Catholics.

"To escape from his creditors he had taken service in the Papal army; had fallen, shamming death, at the first encounter, and to get clear off after the battle was over, had changed clothes and passports with an officer of his own regiment, who had been killed. He had been cunning enough to leave the officer's scapular on the body, and to put the beads into the pocket of, and the decorations upon the breast of, his own jacket in which he had dressed the corpse.

"These things, found on the body of a private soldier, were taken as undoubted proofs of his virtues and valor. According to the passport, the defunct was a native of Poitiers, Pie's diocese, and when the news of so edifying a death reached him, he thought the occasion too valuable not to be improved—with the result as above.

"And the result was also improved by the Liberals, who published an account of the affair in double columns. In the one was the discourse delivered by Monsignor Pie; in the other the police report of the martyr's antecedents and shortcomings!"

We have before seen that several famous cities were in ancient times supposed to be preserved by charms such as the *Palladium* and the *Ancile*. Just in the same manner the images and relics of saints are the security of cities now. Thus, there is an annual procession on the fifth of September at Pegli, near Genoa, in honor of St. Rosalia; because in A.D. 1667 she protected the place from a prevailing pestilence. In a church near Nice a lady once drew my attention to an ugly little image of the Virgin, which she told me had saved the town from cholera. She quite believed it, poor thing, and I well remember the energy of her statement. I had previously asked her if the tawdry little goddess was miraculous: "*Molto miraculoso*, Signore," was her reply.

We have already seen that the *Bulla*—there is a fine specimen in gold in the Vatican Etruscan Museum—contained the charm which blessed the children of heathen Rome: a parallel may be found in these days.

"What, madam," said I to a French lady, "permit me to ask, is that object hung round the neck of your infant?"

"That, sir," she replied, "is a medal blessed by the priest, to keep the child from harm."

So the Heathen usage is continued in the Christian custom.

The coral charm, before alluded to, acts precisely the same part now as it did in old Rome, "affording health and protection to children." So wrote Pliny, and so his people still believe, and even now protect their children with coral against evil spirits.

Did you, reader, ever observe how the old painters often deck even the Holy Child Jesus with this Heathen talisman? We give a specimen above, after a picture by Pinturicchio, in the National Gallery. The four detached ornaments belong to the Child Jesus in other pictures—by Lippi, Crivelli, and others—also in the National Gallery. See pp. 37, 88, 151, 270, and 330, of the authorized catalogue, 1876.

Seven examples may, I think, be found in the gallery.

Sometimes the charm is attached to a coral necklace, and bracelets of the same material are occasionally added.

Nor is this amulet represented only on canvas. Among the bronzes in the South Kensington Museum it may be seen in bronze on the necks of a pair of children—seventeenth century—a Child Jesus and a Cupid. What a union!

We have already remarked that a superstitious Pagan blessed himself on leaving home, by some form of incantation thrice repeated. The worshipper of Papal times blesses himself by signing the cross three times.

The use of Lustral, or Holy Water, by the ancients has also been noticed. They applied it to the purification of houses, as well as persons, and even in this they are still followed. "The modern Italians," says Blunt, "use holy water as a charm. All their rooms are annually sprinkled with it." *Vestiges*, p. 172. The writer has himself witnessed this ceremony in Florence at Easter.

Modern holy water is mixed with salt; how very ancient and Pagan this custom is, the following rendering from Theocritus (xxiv., 95-7) will show:

"With sulphur let the house be purified;
Then, from a full urn, sprinkle on the floor
Pure water, mixed with salt, from side to side;
For so the holy custom doth provide."

I conclude the chapter with a specimen of the unlimited popular belief in this charm. It is quoted from a letter which appeared in a Roman Catholic journal, from one who is entrusted, apparently, with the care of Irish emigrants.

"A storm was raging, when an old woman sent for me. I went to her. She said she had a bottle of holy water, and that if I sprinkled the ship with it, it might still the storm. I complied with her request; after which she desired me to throw the bottle into the sea, so that it might calm the rage of the angry waters."

CHAPTER XIV.

USE OF CHARMS IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

PART III.

We have stated that, in Pagan China, the remains of a sacrifice to Confucius are carried away and given to children as a talisman, "to make them become great men." A few instances will now be cited of the uses to which the consecrated wafer, filched from "the Sacrifice of the Mass," is applied in Christendom by way of a charm.

The following are from Picart. "Sometimes," he says, "it is used as a love-charm, or philtre, both for honorable purposes, and by priests in dishonest love. Here is an example of the former.

"'A woman of Ancona,' says the Monk Bassius, 'with an unfaithful hus-

band, reserved part of the wafer in her mouth, took it home, and then made it into a philtre to win back his love.' "

Very much like the passage of Virgil quoted in a former chapter—

" Back to his home from the city, my charms, draw the wandering Daphnis."

Again, we find, also from Bassius, that the wafer has been used as a bee-charm. The bees belonging to a certain woman were barren; so one day she did not swallow the Host at the Communion, and, "after taking it out of her mouth, placed it in one of her hives."

It will also serve as a garden-charm. A young girl of the Isle of St. Nicholas had a garden which was eaten up by caterpillars. So she, like the others, hides the wafer in her mouth, and then, "breaking it into morsels, sows it broadcast among the vegetables."

Again, "a woman of virtue and of piety," whose son Accacius was born blind, cured him by a poultice made of this charmed bread.

But the wafer can develop still more extraordinary powers. It was the custom, Deacon Amaliri, of Metz, informs us, to bury the dead with a wafer laid on the stomach; and this, he adds, was done in the case of St. Cuthbert. Now, there was a certain man so wicked that when, after his decease, attempts were made to bury him, his dead body was twice cast out by the earth. His relations were distressed and perplexed, and appealed for advice to no less a person than St. Benedict. The saint directed them to use the charm just described, and gave them a wafer for the purpose with his own hand—*de la propre main*. This treatment proved successful, and the corpse was comfortably settled in its grave.—*Picart*, xi., 49-65.

Picart considers that the custom of burying with a wafer is a relic of Paganism, and that the wafer on the stomach was substituted for the coin which used to be put into the mouth of the corpse for the purpose of paying Charon's fee.

In the Twenty-eighth Article of the Church of England it is affirmed "that Transubstantiation hath given occasion to many superstitions." If any of us have not hitherto realized the force of this, we can hardly fail to do so after considering the quotations just given.

To one believing in Transubstantiation, the desire to have the Host buried with him is surely most natural and proper. It certainly would be my wish had I faith in the doctrine; for how comforting the idea of having God with one's flesh in the grave!

Yes, and that, too, of having Him certainly with us in life. Were I a believer of the type of the woman of Ancona, or the girl of St. Nicholas' Isle, I fear I should long ago have yielded to sore temptation, just as they did, to effect such a purpose; and would wear the filched wafer ever round my neck. I entirely sympathize, *not* with their theft, but with the cravings of their humanity.

Of the caterpillars we will not say much: the girl, though sincere, must have been idle; or why did she not pick them off with her fingers? But the

wife of Ancona—conceive! To be able by means so simple to restore the love of her “wandering Daphnis”!

The *quantity* of bread given to the recipient in the Sacrament has also been a cause of superstition: for the Church of Rome uses a large and a small wafer.

“Pride,” says Picart, “leads some laics to desire to communicate with the large wafer—*grande Hostie*—in order to distinguish themselves from those—*pour se distinguer des autres*—who have only the small one.” And he describes the manner in which the Sieur of Schlosperg, in the Tyrol, was punished by God for this sin, the pavement of the church yawning at his feet to swallow him up. St. Theresa, too, he says, avowed that she was glad to receive a great wafer; and so others, piously but ignorantly, “in order to obtain more abundant grace—*en vue de recevoir des graces plus abondantes*.”

Well, poor things, who blames them? I am sure I do not: it would have been the same with me but for the grace of God through the Reformation. We are all alike enveloped in nature's night until the Word of God shines into our dark heart.

Another powerful amulet, among Heathens and Christians alike, is the *Cross*.

Here is what *The Poor Man's Catechism* teaches in regard to it. “This sacred sign is a means of preserving us from evil spirits, which disappear at its sight.” How impudent a statement, when we remember some of the scenes in which the cross or crucifix has been prominent!

An engraving illustrating this charm, and intended for the instruction of young people, is sold in Paris. It depicts a child calling his good angel to succor him against a serpent which crawls towards him. In the child's hand is a cross, and the angel says, “Carry that sign before thee in confidence, and the serpent will be powerless at thy feet.” How well this “Catholic” print agrees with another verse of the passage quoted above from Virgil's *Eclogue*:

“Crushed by the force of charms the cold snake lies dead in the meadow.”

The following from *Picart* (i., 102) is curious.

In Toulouse there is a considerable portion of the cross, which is exhibited twice in the year. At those times it is steeped in water, and the water is afterwards given to the sick, who find it a great comfort—*qui s'en trouvent extrêmement soulagés*.

The *scapular* and the *rosary* are also powerful charms. Of the efficacy of the latter the following story—from Ford's *Handbook for Spain*, vol. ii., p. 192—is an example.

“A robber, shot by a traveller, was buried. His comrades passing by, sometime afterwards, heard his voice. They opened the grave, and found him alive and unhurt; for when he was killed he had a rosary round his neck, and consequently, St. Dominick—its inventor—was enabled to intercede with the Virgin on his behalf.”

(*To be continued.*)